



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/514,461	02/28/2000	Neta Amit	1018.075US1	8500

23460 7590 01/15/2004

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

STULBERGER, CAS P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/514,461

Applicant(s)

AMIT ET AL.

Examiner

Cas Stulberger

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 19, and 20 are rejected because the difference in scope between these claims and the claims on which they depend is indeterminate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,835,726 to Shwed et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,797 to Jade et al.

In regard to claims 1-8, and 12-20, Shwed discloses a system using firewalls that filter packets as they flow into and out of the network. A user generates a rule base which is converted into a set of filter language instruction. Each rule in the rule base includes a source, destination, and whether to accept or reject the packet. The inspection engine acts as a virtual packet filtering

Art Unit: 2132

machine which determines on a packet by packet basis whether to reject or accept a packet. If a packet is rejected it is dropped (Schwed: Abstract). This meets the limitations of (upon verification by filtering the request in the first phase, filtering the request in a second phase particular to the supported protocol to which the request is pursuant to verify at least one of: a source, a destination, and content of the request relative to the supported protocol to which the request is pursuant; and otherwise denying the request.” However Schwed does not teach “filtering a request in a first phase to verify only at least one of: that the request is pursuant to a supported protocol; that a command of the request is allowable; that a length of the request does not exceed an allowable maximum for the command of the request; that characters of the request are of an allowable type.”

Jade et al however discloses a firewall environment between two servers. When a packet is to be sent from one server to the other the packet is checked to verify that the request is a valid one. If the request is invalid it is ignored (Jade: column 4, lines 9-32). This meets the limitation of “filtering a request in a first phase to verify only at least one of: that the request is pursuant to a supported protocol; that a command of the request is allowable; that a length of the request does not exceed an allowable maximum for the command of the request; that characters of the request are of an allowable type.”

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of filtering packets based on source and destination address as disclosed by Schwed with the method of filtering packets depending on if the request is valid as disclosed by Jade in order to only receive requests that appear to be directed to a port

Art Unit: 2132

inside the firewall, and distinguish those request as valid only if they are direct to a currently valid entry (Jade: column 4, lines 16-22).

In regards to claim 9, Schwed discloses the filtering is performed in a firewall (Abstract).

In regards to claims 10 and 11, Schwed discloses that packet filters are installed on the host device such as the workstation or gateway at which protection is desired (Schwed: column 6, lines 25-27). This meets the limitation of "at least one second phase filtering mechanism are implemented within another server."

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,951,651 to Lakshman

U.S. Patent No. 5,781,534 to Perlman et al.

U.S. Patent No. 5,630,757 to Gagin et al.

U.S. Patent No. 4,754,420 to Jensen

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cas Stulberger whose telephone number is (703) 305-8034. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00A.M. - 5:00P.M.


Art Unit: 2132

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703) 305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

CS

CS


GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100